DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 185 595 CS 205 520

AUTHOR Ross, George H.; Middleton, Mildred
TITLE Evaluation of a Local District Developed Spelling Program Based on Fifty Years of Research.
PUB DATE Apr 80
NOTE 42p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Boston, MA, April 7-11, 1980).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Educational Research; Elementary Secondary Education; Program Content; *Program Development; *Program Effectiveness; *Program Evaluation; *Spelling; *Spelling Instruction

ABSTRACT

The Cedar Rapids Community School District used the CIPP (context, input, process, and product) evaluation model to improve its spelling program. During the CIPP model's final stage of product evaluation, the district used test data to decide whether the revised spelling program maintained spelling ability and provided for additional growth. The Iowa Tests of Basic Skills (ITBS) spelling subtest results from fall 1975 (before program implementation) were compared to fall 1977 results (after implementation). The spring 1977 and spring 1979 results of district developed spelling tests were also compared. These district tests were in two formats--editing/multiple choice and list/dictation. The ITBS results indicated increases in spelling scores for all grades. Comparison of the 1977 and 1979 district spelling tests in the editing formats showed maintenance for grades two through four and growth in grades five through ten. The tests in the list/dictation format showed maintenance for grades two through eight and growth in grades nine and ten. (A copy of the teacher-administrator management guide to the district's spelling program is appended.) (RL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED185595

EVALUATION OF A LOCAL DISTRICT DEVELOPED SPELLING PROGRAM BASED ON FIFTY YEARS OF RESEARCH

George H. Ross and Mildred Middleton
Cedar Rapids Community Schools
Cedar Rapids, Iowa

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
George H. Ross
Mildred Middleton
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

A Paper Presented for Presentation at the American Educational Research Association Annual Meeting

Boston, Massachusetts
April 7-11, 1980

CS 205 520

EVALUATION OF A LOCAL DISTRICT DEVELOPED SPELLING PROGRAM BASED ON FIFTY YEARS OF RESEARCH

For decision-making the Cedar Rapids Community School District has utilized the Dan Stufflebeam CIPP evaluation model many times. Evaluations under Context, Input, Process, and Product have served us well. We look to see where we are and where we want to be. We review our programs in relation to other alternatives and research; monitor our progress toward the objectives of the new or revised plan; and check at specific times to determine whether our objectives have been met.

We brought CIPP into play with our spelling program. In viewing the program under Context Evaluation we asked, "How well is our spelling program maintaining spelling ability? How well is our spelling program providing for additional growth?" Our fall ITBS results indicated that generally the spelling instruction produced scores reflecting above the national average for grades up through five and expected growth from grade to grade. Spelling instruction in grades above five scored below the national average and showed growth below expectations.

Under Input Evaluation we took to heart what Walter Petty said about spelling instruction, "Much has been learned but the knowledge has not been used. The problem in spelling really is the application of what is known."

The University of Iowa and the Department of Public Instruction published a Monograph, Spelling: Learning and Instruction, by Robert Fitzsimmons and Bradley Loomer (1974) which compiled 50 years of research in spelling. From the findings of this research, the authors reported

that spelling improvement can be attained by:

1. Utilization of a research based spelling program;
2. Understanding of where teachers are most likely to error in their beliefs and practices;
3. Increased use of research supported practices;
4. Elimination of practices not supported by research.

Even though considerable emphasis had been placed on the teaching of spelling in the Cedar Rapids Community Schools, standardized test results and students' work in written composition did not meet the high degree of competency in spelling expected of the students in this community. When the spelling program, then in operation, was studied in relation to the Research Monograph and found to be discrepant, a wide variety of commercial spelling programs were assessed. Some of the research supported procedures were found in each of the texts, but none included all the recommended procedures, and all included procedures not supported by research.

Through the cooperation of Bradley Loomer, University of Iowa and co-author of the Monograph, a plan was devised for the Cedar Rapids Community Schools to develop its own spelling program based on research. The district's program development was guided by the findings reported in the Monograph:

1. The spelling words of highest frequency in child and adult writing should be studied.
2. Presenting spelling words in list form, initially, is a more successful method than presenting spelling words in sentences or paragraph form.
3. The test-study-test method is superior to the study-test-study method when working with most students.
4. Children correcting their own spelling tests, under the direction of the teacher, is the single most important factor in learning to spell.

5. Learning words by the whole word method is a better technique than learning words by syllables.

6. Time allotted for the study of spelling should be between sixty and seventy-five minutes per week.

7. Provision should be made within a spelling program for the systematic review of spelling words.

8. In order to learn to spell, it is not necessary for children to learn the meaning of the majority of their spelling words.

9. Spelling lists derived from the various curricular areas are of little value in increasing spelling ability.

10. Due to the nature of the English language, most attempts to teach spelling by phonic rules are questionable.

11. The major contribution of spelling games is the stimulation of pupil interest.

12. Merely writing words several times each without a specific method of study will not insure retention.

13. Marking the hard spots of a word will not improve spelling ability.

14. Writing words in the air is not a valuable means of helping the child practice the spelling of a word.

As a part of related research with our teaching staff we found that while our teachers agreed with some of the findings reported in the Monograph, their practices were not congruent with the findings. Two doctoral studies (Baldwin 1975 and McNeil 1977) demonstrated that teachers could be inserviced on spelling instruction based on the research findings and that principals could provide the instructional leadership in this area.

During the school year 1975-76, the Cedar Rapids spelling program, Improving Spelling Performance, was written by Mildred Middleton, language arts coordinator for the Cedar Rapids Schools. In the appendix is the management guide for teachers and administrators for Improving Spelling Performance. The guide describes the process used to generate the

appropriate spelling lists and the method of spelling instruction that utilizes the findings of the Monograph.

To help insure that the real curriculum in the classroom was close to the district curriculum the inservice for Improving Spelling Performance was conducted by the principals. Principals were given additional help in monitoring the program.

During the year of implementation 1976-77, periodic maintenance tests and classroom observations were used for Process Evaluation. The words in the maintenance tests were generated from words missed by students on weekly tests. The yearly plan provides four weekly tests followed by a maintenance test. The maintenance tests were designed in each classroom by the teacher using the words most frequently missed by the students on tests the previous four weeks. Copies of these tests were sent in to the district's research and evaluation department. The words most frequently reported were used in the pool from which words were randomly selected for two district tests for each grade level to be used as final tests.

One type of test for the district was fashioned after the format of the ITBS spelling tests. Each item consists of four words and a no mistake choice. The student selects the word that is misspelled, or if none, marks the no mistake choice. Some educators have been critical of editing format and say it is not a test of spelling. To satisfy this group another test was developed from the same pool of words. This alternate test consists of a list of words to be dictated by the teacher.

At the end of the first year the maintenance tests and final tests were reviewed. Considering the pool from which the words were selected, the mean scores were higher than expected. It was felt a good score would be fifty per cent of the items correct. In the editing format the scores

ranged from 50% for 7th grade to 84% for 2nd grade, and in the list format 51% for 7th grade to 92% for 2nd grade. The correlation between the two formats ranged from .6063 to .8787.

The time allotted to spelling was under 75 minutes per week as compared to more than 100 minutes in the earlier program. The reduced time for spelling did not appear to have been detrimental.

After reviewing the data only minor changes were made in the spelling program. No further changes would be made until another testing period.

To bring the CIPP model full cycle the Product Evaluation would determine whether the spelling program maintained spelling ability and provided for additional growth. The ITBS spelling subtests results from fall 1975 (before implementation) were compared to fall 1977 (after implementation). The results from the district developed tests, both the editing format and the list format for spring 1977 were compared to spring 1979.

The ITBS results shown in Table 1 indicate increases in scores for all grades. The same form of the ITBS was used for the two testing periods.

Comparing the 1977 and 1979 end of year results of the district spelling tests with the editing format, Table 2, showed maintenance for grades 2, 3, and 4 and growth in grades 5-10.

The final tests, 1977 and 1979, using the list format indicated maintenance for grades 2-8 and growth in grades 9 and 10.

Most of the words in the Cedar Rapids spelling program are recycled 4 to 6 times across grades. Tables 5 and 6 give examples that demonstrate the increase in the per cent of correctly answered items from grade to grade.

The evaluation of a local district developed spelling program based on fifty years of research indicates that it does maintain spelling ability and provides for additional growth. The program will continue to be monitored through additional cycles of CIPP.

TABLE 1

CEDAR RAPIDS COMMUNITY SCHOOLS

SPELLING GRADE EQUIVALENTS
IOWA TESTS OF BASIC SKILLS
FALL TESTING

1975			1977		
Grade	N	Mean	Grade	N	Mean
2	1585	25.7	2	1557	26.4
3	1621	36.0	3	1596	38.0
4	1539	44.4	4	1296	47.6
5	1692	53.6	5	1389	56.1
6	1801	64.0	6	1369	65.8
7	1772	70.5	7	1599	71.6
8	1816	77.4	8	1679	79.3
9	1828	85.2	9	1606	86.8

TABLE 2

CEDAR RAPIDS COMMUNITY SCHOOLS

FINAL SPELLING TEST
EDITING FORMAT

Grade	Test Items	1977 N	1977 Mean	1977 SD	1979 N	1979 Mean	1979 SD	t	Level of Significance
2	30	677	25.21	5.4	824	25.08	5.4	-0.541	ns
3	30	704	24.00	6.0	819	24.13	6.2	0.477	ns
4	45	719	30.10	9.3	843	30.66	9.1	1.362	ns
5	45	695	29.68	8.8	768	30.54	9.5	2.102	.05
6	45	750	26.29	9.3	805	27.76	9.2	3.559	.001
7	45	752	22.48	8.7	702	23.73	9.1	3.148	.01
8	45	702	24.80	8.9	747	25.89	9.5	2.645	.01
9	45	718	27.12	9.1	883	27.99	8.9	2.169	.05
10	45	648	27.83	8.5	831	28.96	8.9	2.904	.01

TABLE 3

CEDAR RAPIDS COMMUNITY SCHOOLS

FINAL SPELLING TEST
LIST FORMAT

Grade	Test Items	1977 N	1977 Mean	1977 SD	1979 N	1979 Mean	1979 SD	t	Level of Significance
2	24	194	22.20	2.84	207	22.47	2.41	1.088	ns
3	45	221	35.70	9.32	200	35.13	10.11	-0.618	ns
4	75	202	53.20	18.09	214	54.51	15.47	0.820	ns
5	75	191	51.80	16.98	194	49.84	18.45	-1.102	ns
6	75	227	46.00	20.48	202	45.47	20.05	-0.274	ns
7	75	220	38.00	19.45	186	40.48	20.39	1.311	ns
8	75	198	42.90	18.12	203	45.64	20.40	1.492	ns
9	75	211	45.70	18.73	213	50.31	18.15	2.629	.01
10	75	198	47.90	17.48	216	53.23	17.64	3.191	.001

TABLE 4

COMPARISON OF SPELLING TESTS

Grade	Between ITBS and Final Spelling Tests Editing Format N	Correlation	Grade	Between Final Tests Editing Format and List Format N	Correlation
2	379	.5337	2	204	.6063
3	410	.7129	3	211	.7960
4	392	.7598	4	197	.7955
5	404	.8204	5	191	.8250
6	400	.8184	6	190	.8598
7	420	.8172	7	188	.8787
8	387	.7658	8	214	.8833
			9	203	.8386
			10	203	.8575

TABLE 5

CEDAR RAPIDS COMMUNITY SCHOOLS
ITBS-Spelling Test, Form 7
1979
Percent Answered Correctly

	3	4	5	6	7	8	'9
1. name	94						
2. mouth	77						
3. no mistakes	56						
4. clear	75						
5. blue	92						
6. wall	85						
7. stove	92						
8. think	81						
9. no mistakes	85						
10. rain	64						
11. talked	84	93					
12. filled	63	78					
13. leaves	73	86					
14. no mistakes	57	74					
15. cloth	58	82					
16. pocket	31	59					
17. again	50	70					
18. water	62	81					
19. chew	72	88					
20. brightest	63	78					
21. no mistakes	67	88					
22. pitch	72	87					
23. burn	53	77					
24. exact	63	80	91				
25. no mistakes	64	78	81				
26. raining	51	77	88				
27. knife	27	52	69				
28. rough	66	87	93				
29. holiday	36	64	79				
30. extra	40	58	81				
31. sandy		73	84				
32. decorate		73	86				
33. no mistakes		63	74				
34. cocoon		64	78				
35. season		59	77				
36. worrying		67	79				
37. daughter		50	65				
38. square		59	78				
39. division		49	72	87			
40. nephew		61	70	80			
41. addition		31	39	53			
42. no mistakes		34	58	72			
43. manager		49	72	80			
44. amount		43	52	78			
45. greasy		53	69	77			
46. donkey		26	42	53			

ITBS Spelling continued

	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	
47. return			61	80				
48. island			69	75				
49. no mistakes			57	68				
50. payment			61	75				
51. blessed			61	77				
52. regain			57	70				
53. machine			71	82				
54. neither			58	69				
55. among			52	66				
56. purple			75	80	87			
57. aching			64	74	78			
58. dictionary			42	61	72			
59. no mistakes			58	61	70			
60. infrequent			78	83	88			
61. average			52	72	80			
62. fashion			45	57	69			
63. illustration			35	58	74			
64. community				54	68	76	85	
65. no mistakes				63	71	71	78	
66. northern				47	60	68	77	
67. certainty				51	71	74	79	
68. electricity				69	77	84	88	
69. deny				73	80	84	89	
70. no mistakes				50	63	73	74	
71. drizzle				59	70	73	81	
72. fourteen				67	65	81	84	
73. enclosure				70	83	86	92	
74. cafeteria				66	75	80	83	
75. worthless				55	71	79	84	
76. no mistakes				47	64	70	76	
77. oral				55	66	69	80	
78. commission				53	67	78	88	
79. plenty				27	37	42	55	
80. vapor				46	63	69	80	
81. performed					62	67	77	
82. judicial					71	76	75	
83. elevator					46	49	54	
84. no mistakes					51	55	59	
85. elaborate					67	74	81	
86. pneumonia					58	51	59	
87. miserable					63	64	71	
88. attached					71	76	82	
89. certificate					62	66	75	
90. typewriter					57	66	74	
91. no mistakes					43	55	65	
92. exploration					58	61	74	
93. ransom					63	67	73	
94. no mistakes					52	53	64	
95. mercury					45	57	66	
96. no mistakes					65	75	77	
97. approve					40	48	63	
98. indicate					56	67	77	
99. standpoint						64	71	
100. gradually						35	40	
101. no mistakes						52	55	
102. ambulance						53	63	
103. amazement						54	62	
104. similar						56	71	
105. expansion						48	56	
106. interpret						44	53	
107. negative						25	39	12

TABLE 6

CEDAR RAPIDS COMMUNITY SCHOOLS

Improving Spelling Performance

Secondary Final Spelling Test, 1979

Iowa Spelling Scale Frequency of Accuracies

Grades 7, 8, 9, 10

Item	Word	Iowa Sp. Scale Gr. 7	Grade 7	Iowa Sp. Scale Gr. 8	Grade 8	Grade 9	Grade 10
1	courage	73	80	83	83	86	92
2	knees	71	93	77	90	94	96
3	worried	75	90	84	87	95	92
4	finds	74	91	80	87	93	90
5	until	71	80	82	86	89	89
6	ounce	72	87	79	89	94	94
7	pupils	71	83	77	91	92	92
8	flies	63	80	72	76	82	88
9	weigh	65	82	74	85	87	88
10	paragraph	67	85	72	89	94	95
11	series	67	81	72	85	89	89
12	nephew	61	70	63	73	84	86
13	strict	62	72	78	80	89	87
14	journey	56	75	64	78	86	88
15	puzzle	69	81	70	86	93	89
16	except	68	76	89	79	88	90
17	wealthy	68	74	75	81	87	88
18	awful	59	62	66	74	81	81
19	neither	59	61	70	70	78	75
20	German	59	78	67	78	81	79
21	regardless	52	64	74	67	64	72
22	describing	52	59	60	71	73	80
23	happily	56	83	71	83	94	90
24	pronounce	52	77	73	79	89	88
25	earliest	62	73	70	76	83	88
26	bracelet	44	63	63	75	79	77
27	calendar	47	52	56	57	58	56
28	receiver	45	52	50	56	62	65
29	drowned	47	69	62	71	75	73
30	invitation	46	56	56	62	74	81
31	magazines	47	65	63	68	82	85
32	vegetables	44	56	59	65	73	74
33	development	50	54	56	63	67	75
34	separate	38	38	41	44	46	50
35	scarcely	40	57	43	65	67	74
36	precious	44	56	48	67	70	76
37	candidate	36	56	41	66	75	78
38	tremendous	40	56	50	68	71	77
39	opposition	38	47	58	53	66	76
40	receiving	44	50	45	56	62	64
41	February	41	41	47	55	62	64
42	exercise	42	53	49	63	76	74
43	commercial	33	45	58	49	65	76
44	physical	35	53	47	67	79	79
45	specified	33	60	55	69	76	81
46	advertisement	31	48	46	53	63	56
47	opportunity	35	35	47	43	46	56
48	guardian	32	33	47	44	52	59
49	individual	30	45	41	56	69	77
50	bouquet	32	31	45	34	47	50

Item	Word	Iowa Sp. Scale Gr. 7	Grade 7	Iowa Sp. Scale Gr. 8	Grade 8	Grade 9	Grade 10
51	sensible	27	42	49	54	59	63
52	gratitude	25	45	40	59	59	61
53	recommended	25	37	31	42	52	55
54	receipt	26	31	33	34	43	54
55	transferred	29	37	37	48	48	52
56	distribution	28	50	49	62	67	72
57	occasional	26	46	50	50	51	58
58	vacancies	27	44	39	56	69	69
59	vein	22	47	43	66	69	80
60	wretched	21	27	25	38	41	48
61	colonel	24	24	31	31	41	50
62	intimate	23	32	33	48	56	55
63	cordially	23	19	31	34	34	55
64	peculiar	26	33	36	39	41	55
65	curiosity	21	34	35	39	42	49
66	associated	21	40	45	60	69	74
67	faculty	21	41	48	45	54	61
68	exquisite	13	25	27	29	44	44
69	endeavoring	9	30	16	34	40	49
70	hygiene	18	21	31	24	27	33
71	guaranteed	9	19	11	26	32	38
72	cylinder	17	47	25	53	69	71
73	mortgage	11	24	16	32	36	46
74	indefinitely	4	19	10	20	36	34
75	discipline	11	26	14	29	39	47

APPENDIX

IMPROVING SPELLING PERFORMANCE

MANAGEMENT GUIDE FOR TEACHERS AND ADMINISTRATORS

BY

MILDRED MIDDLETON
ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS COORDINATOR
CEDAR RAPIDS COMMUNITY SCHOOLS
CEDAR RAPIDS, IOWA

TABLE OF CONTENTS

REVIEW OF RELATED RESEARCH AND LITERATURE IN SPELLING

Historical Development of the Word Lists. 1
Background for the Cedar Rapids Program 3
Development of Master Lists/Weekly Word Lists 6
Elementary Leveling Tests 7
Combination Rooms/Initial Spelling Test 8
Final Weekly Spelling Test. 9
Test-Study-Test Sheet/Studying Misspelled Words 10
Maintenance 12
The Spelling Folder/My Own Word List. 13
Spelling Performance Sheet. 14
Second Grade Spelling 14
The Less Able Student in Spelling 15
Organizational Information for Administrators 16
Materials Needed
In-service Information
Supervision of Teachers
Instructions for Teachers 18
Letter to Parent. 20

APPENDIX A (Second Grade)

Word Lists. 1a
Leveling Test (a) 19a
Maintenance Test. 22a
Final Test (Part I and II). 37a
My Own Word List. 39a
Performance Chart 40a
Test-Study-Test Sheet 41a
Answer Sheet on Leveling Test 43a
Yearly Plan 44a

APPENDIX B (Third Grade)

Word Lists. 45b
Leveling Test (a & b) 99b
Maintenance Test. 105b
Final Test (Part I and II). 140b
My Own Word List. 142b
Performance Chart 143b
Test-Study-Test Sheet 144b
Answer Sheet on Leveling Test 146b
Yearly Plan 147b

APPENDIX C (Fourth Grade)

Word Lists. 148c
Leveling Test (a & b) 202c
Maintenance Test. 208c
Final Test (Part I and II). 232c
My Own Word List. 235c
Performance Chart 236c
Test-Study-Test Sheet 237c
Answer Sheet on Leveling Test 239c
Yearly Plan 240c

APPENDIX D (Fifth Grade)

Word Lists. 241d
Leveling Test (a & b) 295d
Maintenance Test. 301d
Final Test (Part I and II). 325d
My Own Word List. 328d
Performance Chart 329d
Test-Study-Test Sheet 330d
Answer Sheet on Leveling Test 332d
Yearly Plan 333d

APPENDIX E (Sixth Grade)

Word Lists. 334e
Leveling Test (a & b) 388e
Maintenance Test. 394e
Final Test (Part I and II). 418e
My Own Word List. 421e
Performance Chart 422e
Test-Study-Test Sheet 423e
Answer Sheet on Leveling Test 425e
Yearly Plan 426e

CEDAR RAPIDS COMMUNITY SCHOOLS

REVIEW OF RELATED RESEARCH AND LITERATURE IN SPELLING

Historical Development of the Word Lists

The investigation of children's "writing vocabularies" began in 1913 when F. W. Jones studied approximately 15,000,000 common running words which yielded 4,532 common, running words used by two or more percent of selected pupils' writing. Similar studies were continued by Bauer, 1916, Tidyman, 1921, Fitzgerald, 1931, McKee, 1939 and Rinsland, 1945. All found approximately the same number of basic, common, writing words among diversified populations throughout the country. Ernest Horn's famous Basic Writing Vocabulary yielding 10,000 most commonly used words in writing is a composite of these important studies and his personal investigations of running words. Throughout the 1940's the 10,000 common running words were reviewed and researched by many authorities.

In the early fifties, Greene developed an up-to-date list of words designed to give practical assistance to elementary teachers in the teaching of spelling. Sampling thousands of children in all areas of the country, at all grade levels, he determined that finding frequency of accuracies for each word was an exacting, monumental task. In 1954, Greene's The New Iowa Spelling Scale was published naming the 5,507 most commonly used words as found by leading authorities that would make a complete spelling program.

Ernest Horn stated, "Less than 4% of the 5,507 words have come into the language since 1849, and less than 10% have come in since 1794. More of these words were in the language before 1099 than have come into the language since 1749.

In 1954, E. Horn and Otto wrote that to require a student in the elementary school to learn more than 2800-3000 spelling words is out of harmony with research.

1. The most common 1,000 words and their repetition comprise 90 percent of running writing.
2. The most common 2,000 account for 95.3 percent.
3. The most common 3,000 account for 97.6 percent.
4. The most common 4,000 account for 98.7 percent.
5. The most common 5,000 account for 99.2 percent.

For many years spelling authorities have generally agreed on the list of words that need to be learned. Their great concern in the fifties and sixties was finding ways in which students could learn to spell the common words.

The fifty years of research showed evidence that teachers can teach spelling with professional efficiency, but teachers appeared to lack knowledge of existing evidence, or they did not apply the evidence intelligently, or made erroneous interpretations of the known facts. In 1969, Walter Petty stated, "Much has been learned but the knowledge has not been used. The problem in spelling really is the application of what is known."

In 1974, the State University of Iowa and the Department of Public Instruction published a monograph, Spelling: Learning and Instruction, by Robert Fitzsimmons and Bradley Loomer which compiled the fifty years of research in spelling. Improvement of instruction and improved spelling ability were two major objectives of the research reviewed.

From the findings on this research, the authors reported that spelling improvement can be attained by:

1. Utilization of a research based spelling program;
2. Understanding of where teachers are most likely to error in their beliefs and practices;
3. Increased use of research supported practices;
4. Elimination of practices not supported by research.

The Monograph listed the following "Research-Supported Procedures in Spelling":

1. Presenting spelling words in list form, initially, is a more successful method than presenting spelling words in sentences or paragraph form.
2. The spelling words of highest frequency in child and adult writing should be studied.
3. The child correcting his own spelling test, under the direction of the teacher, is the single most important factor in learning to spell.
4. In order to learn to spell, it is not necessary for children to learn the meaning of a majority of their spelling words.
5. Spelling lists derived from the various curricular areas are of little value in increasing spelling ability.
6. Learning words by the whole method is a better technique than learning words by syllables.
7. Due to the nature of the English language, most attempts to teach spelling by phonic rules are questionable.
8. Time allotted for the study of spelling should be between an hour and seventy-five minutes per week.
9. The test-study-test method is superior to the study-test-study method when working with most students.
10. The major contribution of spelling games is the stimulation of pupil interest.

11. Writing words several times each without a specific method of study will not insure retention.
12. Marking the hard spots of a word will not improve spelling ability.
13. Writing words in the air is not a valuable means of helping the child practice the spelling of a word.
14. Provisions should be made within the program for systematic review.

The study of the Monograph and its relationship to instruction showed clearly "... the chief problem today appears to be more critical and universal application of the evidence now available." Ernest Horn, 1960.

Background for the Cedar Rapids Program

Even though considerable emphasis had been placed on the teaching of spelling in the Cedar Rapids Community Schools, standardized test results and students' work in written composition did not meet the high degree of competency in spelling expected of the students in this community.

Research in spelling had been pursued in Cedar Rapids for many years, but the methods used by teachers remained unchanged. Evidence found in research was not applied in the classrooms.

In June, 1975, after discussing the Monograph and its implications for instruction with Bradley Loomer, the language arts coordinator decided to write a spelling program based on fourteen Research-Supported Procedures.

It was agreed that Bradley Loomer, Professor of Education, The University of Iowa, would cooperate by interpreting instructional procedures that would enhance spelling growth. George Ross, Director of Research in Cedar Rapids Community Schools, would assume responsibility for assessing and evaluating the program and interpreting the data for teachers and administrators. Mildred Middleton, Language Arts Coordinator in the Cedar Rapids Community Schools, would develop Master and Weekly Spelling Lists for each grade level, develop Maintenance and Final Tests and write specific instructions for the implementation of the program. Principals would supervise the program. In each building, through Board approval and cooperation of the Assistant Superintendent in charge of Curriculum and Instruction, the District Staff would be directed to follow the program.

Before beginning the task of writing, a wide variety of commercial spelling programs were assessed for content, methods, study procedures, and evaluation. Some of the Research-Supported Procedures were found in each of the texts, but no commercial books included all the recommended procedures and all included procedures not supported by research.

A variety of standardized tests were then compared with the 5,507 words in the New Iowa Spelling Scale. All tests included some curricular area words. Many lists were composed of very difficult words. Some tests used multiple choice selection. Others used lists. It appeared that the Iowa Test of Basic Skills would be the valid normative data measurement for a Cedar Rapids program.

The New Iowa Spelling Scale would provide ample common running words for students to study in grades 2-10.

In 1975, Ron Baldwin, Elementary Principal, Vinton, Iowa, conducted a study at the University of Iowa to determine the effect of inservice training and knowledge of research upon teacher perceptions of spelling procedures and practices, and upon the spelling achievement of their students.

The specific problems of this study were: (1) To ascertain the degree to which teacher inservice training and knowledge of research will affect the spelling spelling achievement of elementary school children, (2) To ascertain the degree to which teacher exposure to research, without reinforcing inservice, will affect the spelling achievement of elementary school children, (3) To ascertain the degree to which teacher inservice training and knowledge of research will affect attitudes toward perceptions of the teaching of spelling, and (4) To ascertain the degree to which teacher exposure to research, without re-inforcing inservice training, will affect attitudes toward and perceptions of the teaching of spelling.

The major conclusions were the following:

1. It is more effective to present information to teachers in written form accompanied by appropriate in-service training sessions than to present information in written form alone.
2. It is possible to effect changes in teacher perceptions of classroom procedures as a result of informing teachers about research-supported and research-nonsupported practices and procedures.
3. The in-service group made the greatest change toward the research supported side of the scale, in comparison with the other two treatment groups, on all twenty-five of the items showing significant differences between group change scores, and on 93.7 percent of the thirty-five nonsignificant items.
4. Each procedural item on the questionnaire was paired with an application item. The inservice group was consistent in responding to related items.
5. Practices and procedures which are prevalent in published spelling programs currently in use, but which are not supported by research cited in the monograph and stressed during the in-service sessions, were involved in at least twenty of the twenty-five items showing significant differences between change scores.

   These practices and procedures include teaching many phonic rules, learning words by syllables rather than the whole-word method, studying words before a pre-test, lack of self-correction, stressing meanings of spelling words, marking hard spots in words, and air-writing.

6. Significant differences in student spelling achievement between treatment groups were not detected during the four months this study was conducted. However, it is possible that over a longer period of time significant differences in student achievement might be indicated.
7. Significant differences in achievement between boys and girls were noted on all student measures, in favor of the girls.

In 1977, Robert McNiel, Elementary Principal, Hoover School, Cedar Rapids, Iowa, made a study at the University of Iowa to determine the degree to which teacher inservice training and knowledge of research-supported and nonsupported practices in spelling which was conducted by the elementary principals to their staffs, changed teachers' attitudes and perceptions of spelling procedures and practices.

The problems were involved:

1. Effect on inservice by principals in a one-half day session with principals monitoring the program immediately following the inservice.
2. Effect of inservice by principals in a one-half day session with principals monitoring the program eight weeks after the inservice.
3. Effect of in-service by principals in three separate inservice meetings within three separate one-half day sessions, with principals monitoring the program immediately following the inservice.
4. Effect of inservice by principals to their staffs during three separate one-half day sessions, with principals monitoring the program eight weeks after the inservice.

Major conclusions:

1. It is possible to effect changes in the teacher's perception towards the teaching of spelling as a result of informing teachers about research-supported and research nonsupported practices and procedures.
2. There was no significant advantage between giving the inservice during one session or giving the inservice during three separate sessions except for nine of the forty-two items.

   Of the nine items showing significant differences, eight of the items indicated there was a significant advantage to having only one session of inservice.
3. The study indicated there was no advantage as to when the principal monitored the spelling program. However, due to the principal's involvement teachers indicated that their principal provided them with instructional leadership which helped them in the teaching of spelling, had been highly supportive and provided the teachers with encouragement about the teaching of spelling, and had encouraged the teacher's use of research-supported practices and procedures in the teaching of spelling.

Development of Master Lists

The laborious, tedious task of making Master Lists for each grade level began in 1975. The new Iowa Spelling Scale provided the words for each grade. The Master Lists include words at all levels of difficulty (easy to very difficult) for each grade level. Words considered difficult for one grade level might be average or easy for another. Thus, provision was made within the Master Lists for a systematic review of spelling words at all difficulty levels.

Development of Weekly Word Lists

Research supports:

"Initial presentation of spelling words in list form is a more successful method than initial presentation of spelling words in a sentence, phrase, or paragraph form."

Twenty-seven weekly lists of spelling words divided into six levels of difficulty are written for each grade. The number of words per week and per level are as follows: grade two, 12 words; grade three, 20 words; and all succeeding grades include 25 words per level, per week.

The majority of words become easier for the student as instruction continues from grade to grade. However, some words, commonly called spelling demons, remain difficult for students and adults to learn. All 5,507 words appear several times in primary through secondary grades at different levels of difficulty.

In selecting the words for each list no special consideration was given to spelling patterns, phonic rules, spelling rules or variations in meaning. All words were selected from a Master List with designated ranges of difficulty.

Theoretically, most students should master all 5,507 words by grade ten. Those students with very severe spelling difficulties should be assigned to Levels V and VI. Students with spelling problems may not learn all 5,507 words by grade 10,

but should know the 1000 common words which make up 90% of running writing by the time they leave the sixth grade, and hopefully know the most common 2000 words which account for 95.3 percent of any writing that is done; 3000 words account for 97.6 percent; 4000 words account for 98.7 percent and 5000 words account for 99.2 percent of common words that appear in writing.

Elementary Leveling Tests

Leveling Tests are given at the beginning of each semester. Test A is designed for the first semester. Test B is for the second semester. There are 60 words and accompanying sentences in each of the Leveling Tests. The students may be tested in one class period or the words may be pronounced in more than one period.

Teachers not students must correct the leveling tests. When letters are crossed out, written over or are illegible, the word should be considered missed. If a student makes an error and wishes to make an immediate correction, the word should be marked as follows: (~~neice~~niece). One line through the word indicates that the student recognized the error and made immediate correction.

Check words that are misspelled on the leveling test. When the tests are corrected, the teacher will level the students using the following scale:

Grade Two

Level I	(Accelerated)	0-19 words missed.
Level II	(Average)	20-35 words missed.
Level III	(Easy)	36-60 words missed.

Grade Three

Level I	(very difficult)	0-18 words missed.
Level II	(difficult)	19-28 words missed.
Level III	(average)	29-35 words missed.
Level IV	(remedial)	36-50 words missed.
Level V	(special)	51-60 words missed.

Grades Four, Five, Six

Level I	(very difficult)	0-8 words missed.
Level II	(difficult)	9-19 words missed.
Level III	(average)	20-35 words missed.
Level IV	(remedial)	36-50 words missed.
Level V	(special)	51-59 words missed.
Level VI	(for the non-speller)	60 words missed.

Teachers should avoid having more than three spelling groups per classroom. If the spelling scores show the need for four or five groups, the teacher should combine levels. For example: The difficult and very difficult groups could be

combined. Average and remedial may work together. Levels V and VI may be combined.

It is possible that some classes may have only two groups. The more heterogeneous the class, the more levels will be identified. Even though a leveling scale is provided, teacher judgment is necessary in the final determination for leveling.

Combination Rooms

The spelling program is very flexible. In combination rooms spelling lists may be combined so that a teacher will have no more than three groups. For example: A Level II third grade group could have spelling with a Level III fourth grade group. A Level IV sixth grade group could spell with a Level III fifth grade group.

Teacher judgment must be used in combining groups. Students are expected to miss words on the Initial Tests. If 80-90% mastery is not achieved on the Final Weekly Tests and on Maintenance Tests the teacher should assess the leveling by answering the questions found under Maintenance Tests in the Guidebook.

The Initial Spelling Test

All spelling tests are in list or column form. The Initial Test is not seen by the student before the words are pronounced. The purpose of the test is to see which words each pupil needs to study. Students write the words on the Test-Study-Test Sheet as directed.

Teachers should use the following method to pronounce the words:

1. Say the word.
2. Use the word in a short, well constructed sentence.
3. Say the word again. The student then writes the word.
4. Allow no more than 15 seconds per word.
5. When the students have written the word, the teacher immediately pronounces the word again.
6. The teacher then spells the word orally and shows it to the student for the first time in written form. (chalkboard, overhead projector, other)
7. Students correct their own spelling during this procedure by putting a (✓) in front of the misspelled word.

On the Initial Test, letters marked over, crossed out, rewritten, et cetera should be considered wrong. These errors indicate that students are unsure of the words. Students are expected to miss words on the Initial Test. If all papers are perfect or nearly perfect week after week, the leveling should be questioned.

When the Initial Test is completed, the teacher gives each student the appropriate Weekly Test Sheet to be used as a model. The model is placed by the side of the written test, and all the words are checked a second time for misspelling. The students then write the misspelled words correctly in the second column of the Test-Study-Test Sheet. After corrections are finished, the student records the performance score on the Test-Study-Test Sheet and then writes all misspelled words on My Own Word List which is located in the student folder. During the first month of school, the teacher should check all papers after the student has finished the corrections. Students need to be supervised throughout the year as they learn to proofread words they have spelled on the Initial and Final Test. Students must always do the initial correcting.

Final Weekly Spelling Test

The same procedure is used for the Final Weekly Spelling Test as for the Initial Test. The student must correct the test, record the scores, and record the words missed on My Own Word List. The teacher may omit spelling the words to the students in the Final Test unless the students need that reinforcement.

All student corrections are made under the direction of the teacher. Immediate help and encouragement should be given those who need it. Final Test scores should be compared with Initial Test scores to insure growth as well as maintenance. Students may miss words on Friday that they spelled correctly on Monday. Some students neglect practicing words missed. Others are careless in correcting misspelled words. Proper teacher direction and high expectations help students improve study habits and proofreading skills.

The self correction method provides the students immediate opportunity to see words causing difficulty, to correct errors made, and to call attention to the importance of working independently for self improvement. The teacher direction assures the student that self correction and proofreading are essential in learning to spell.

Test-Study-Test Sheet

The Test-Study-Test Sheet is divided into four parts:

1. The Initial Weekly Test - to be given before the students study the words.
2. Corrected Spelling Words- to be copied correctly from the model which is given to the students following the Initial Test.
3. The Final Weekly Test - to be given after four days of study and review.
4. Lines for Studying Words- Missed (back of page)

The Test-Study-Test Sheet is an important component of the spelling program. "The corrected test alone contributes 90-95 percent of the achievement that comes from pronunciation, corrected test, and study.

The corrected test appears to be the single most important factor contributing to spelling achievement." Thomas Horn, 1946

Procedure for Studying Misspelled Words

According to Research the corrected test alone is sufficient for mastery or near mastery of most word lists by the upper 1/3 of the class; however, to be sure that students learn to spell words missed, a structured study method is included for all students.

The Test-Study-Test Sheet provides space for practicing words missed on the back of the sheet. The misspelled word should be copied correctly from the model Weekly Spelling List.

The research shows that merely writing words several times does not insure spelling retention. Loomer says, "Place less reliance on having the child write each word several times. Place more emphasis on systematic recall of words."

The following study method should be used in the Improving Spelling Performance program.

1. Copy the word missed from the model.
2. Check the word carefully with the model.
3. Look at the word and say it.
4. Cover the word with your hand and try to write it exactly as you copied it from the model.
5. Check the word to see if you spelled it correctly.
6. Look at the word again and pronounce it correctly. Cover the word and write it again.
7. Look again to see if the word is spelled correctly.
8. Try to write the word three or four times, each time covering the previous spelling. If no mistakes are made go on to the next word.

Some students may need to repeat this procedure during the week. Others may find the self-correction and one study period sufficient to fulfill their needs.

The Improving Spelling Performance program does not recommend a set time for students to study spelling. That option is left to individual teachers. The following suggestions are offered:

1. Research says that time allotted for the study of spelling should be approximately 60-75 minutes per week. This time includes test taking and self correction. The more time spent on spelling activities will not guarantee more learning.

2. Students are placed at a level in spelling where they can succeed. Therefore, time allotment for spelling should not vary according to the student's need.

3. Proofreading at all grade levels is a difficult skill for students to master. Teachers should be firm and consistent as they teach students to work independently on the self-correcting and study process.

4. The self-correction process is always under the direction of the teacher.

5. Students need to understand that errors are to be expected in tests and written work and that there is a research supported way of learning misspelled words.

6. Group instruction and adjustments to individual differences can be combined in studying the corrected work, but research shows that individual students through the self-correction process can and should be concerned with their own special needs. Teachers should encourage students to plan their own time for study.

Maintenance Tests

Research supports the provision of meaningful opportunities for systematic recall of the spelling of the word, mainly through periodic Maintenance Tests.

Maintenance Tests provide review of those words most frequently missed in weekly tests. Over a period of three years, thousands of student weekly tests were tabulated to find the most frequent errors in spelling. From those tabulations, Maintenance Tests, fifty words each for upper grades and 20 words each for primary grades were designed for each level of spelling.

Students in grades two and three take monthly Maintenance Tests. In grades four-six "teacher developed" Maintenance Tests are given each four weeks, but district Maintenance Tests are provided in the program for the end of each eight weeks of work.

Maintenance Tests (20 words in grades 2 and 3, 50 words in all other grades) tend to show disparities or weaknesses in the program and instruction. Students may achieve success in the Weekly Tests, but have problems with the Maintenance Tests. Teachers should assess these weaknesses using Research Supported Procedures as a basis for assessment.

1. Do the students use the self correcting procedure correctly?
2. Do the students use the recommended procedures for study?
3. Does the teacher emphasize the need for the student to study independently?
4. Are the students properly leveled?
5. Are the teachers following the instructional program as it is designed?
6. Are the students using the Test-Study-Test Sheets for review purposes?
7. Are the individual conferences being held for those who are not achieving?
8. Are the students recording their misspelled words on the My Own Word List for further study?

A good evaluation of the Maintenance Test gives the teacher direction for improvement of instruction. When words appear too easy for the student, a harder level is recommended. It is not necessary to move to a higher grade level if a student shows unusual proficiency in spelling. Level I is composed of very difficult words for that grade level. If the student can spell all the words correctly

at grade level, time used for spelling should be spent in written composition. Never excuse students from the Initial Test, the Maintenance Test or Final Spelling Tests at the end of the year.

The Spelling Folder

The Spelling Folder is an important component of the spelling program. It is to be used by the student, the teacher, the parents, and the administrators. Students at all grade levels should have the folders stored in a central place in the room where spelling is taught. The folders should be kept up-to-date at all times and should be assessed by the teacher regularly.

Teachers and administrators may use the folders to check handwriting, spelling errors, study habits, spelling interests, and growth in spelling.

Teachers should use the folder during the parent conference period. If kept up-to-date, the parent, as well as the student and teacher, can assess the work accomplished in spelling.

Each student must have a Spelling Folder. The following items should be kept there:

1. The Weekly Test-Study-Test Sheets
2. The Weekly Spelling Tests
3. Corrected Maintenance Tests
4. My Own Word List
5. Spelling Improvement Chart

My Own Word List

My Own Word List is designed to help the student become an independent learner. Each student's word list is personal. Words missed on Initial Tests, Final Weekly Tests or Maintenance Tests should be written by each student on the My Own Word List sheet. Words missed in written composition or other school papers should be recorded. Each student has interest words which may be added to the sheet under Interest Words. The following procedures are acceptable in

the use of the My Own Word List:

1. Students write words missed in spelling tests. This exercise provides additional, purposeful practice in writing the words.

2. Words from written composition and other papers will not be tested by the teacher. The student assumes the responsibility for learning the words. Words learned may be deleted or scratched from the list when mastery is assured.

3. Parents may wish to see the lists at conference time.

4. If the student is not keeping My Own Word List in the folder, the supervisor of the building can assume that the student is not missing any words, that the teacher is not encouraging the student to use the sheet, or that the student is "awed" by the number of words missed.

The My Own Word List is a valuable component of the program. It should provide both maintenance and growth as the student becomes motivated to learn spelling.

Spelling Performance Sheet

The spelling performance sheet is designed to help the student keep an individual record of maintenance and growth. The number of words spelled correctly should be written at the bottom of the Test-Study-Test Sheet and on the Spelling Performance Sheet. Words missed are recorded on the Test-Study-Test Sheet and My Own Word List.

Students should be expected to keep the spelling chart up-to-date. It is a self motivator. Parents and teachers should see the chart, also, to assess individual progress of the student.

Second Grade Spelling

Second grade spelling does not start at the beginning of the year. Words on the New Iowa Spelling Scale are so difficult that it is impossible to build twenty-seven lists of words for second grade.

It is recommended that second grade students write imaginative or expressive stories, letters, description, and narration, plus simple exposition throughout the year. Experiences from reading, speaking, listening, and observing will give the student ample opportunity to learn many new words which form the background for spelling lists during the second semester of second grade.

When primary children cannot read successfully above the primer level, it is not recommended that they be assigned to spelling lists. The time allotted to spelling should be used for language development.

The Less-Able Student in Spelling

Questions are asked frequently about the less-able student in spelling. Should the recommended method of studying the whole word be changed when used with the exceptional child? Should the recommended study procedure be altered for the student with severe spelling problems? The answer to these questions is, "No."

Studies, pilot programs, and intensive work in several school systems show that the less-able student, when properly leveled, can achieve in spelling when using the Research-Supported Procedures and the systematic study that are recommended in the Improving Spelling Performance program.

More teacher supervision and instruction may be required, but most children can be taught to work independently and learn to correct their own work.

Some children may always have problems with spelling.

Organizational Information for Administrators

The building principal supervises the spelling program. In addition to being the instructional leader, the principal is responsible for ordering, storing, and distributing of materials. The following information is provided to assist building administrators with their responsibilities in spelling:

Section 1

Materials Needed

1. Monograph for each teacher: Improving Spelling through Scientific Investigation by Robert Fitzsimmons and Bradley Loomer, 1978.
2. Educator's Guide to Spelling Research and Practice, by Bradley Loomer, 1978.
3. Management Guide: Improving Spelling Performance for Administrators, 1980
4. Teachers Guide - Improving Spelling Performance for each teacher, 1980
5. Spelling Lists:
   a. Grade 2 - 18 weeks (1 copy per student)
   b. Grades 3 through 10 - 27 weeks (1 copy per student)
6. Spelling Tests:
   a. Leveling Tests are in the Guidebook.
   b. Maintenance Tests are in the Guidebook.
   c. Final Tests to be given in the spring are in the Guidebook.
   d. Teacher-made maintenance tests, grades 4, 5, 6, based on words misspelled by the students should not be kept on file and used from one year to the next.
7. My Own Word List (Several copies for each student)
8. Performance Charts (1 copy per student)
9. Test-Study-Test Sheets (1 copy per week, per student)
10. Leveling and Maintenance Test Sheet (7 copies per student)
11. ITBS and ITED Test Results
12. Cedar Rapids Final Spelling Test Results

Organizational Information for Administrators

Section 2

In-service Information - The principal will:

1. Provide each teacher with an up-to-date Teacher's Guide.
2. Review the Guide and explain the components of the program to the staff.
3. Inform teachers about the storage area for spelling materials and explain methods of obtaining those materials when needed.
4. Explain the importance of following the Yearly Calendar. (The calendar must be designed each year.)

5. Explain the importance of following directions for Weekly Tests as designed in the program:

   a. Weekly Lists
      (1) Initial Test
      (2) Study Method
      (3) Final Test
      (4) Spelling Folder

6. Explain Maintenance Tests

   a. Students review words spelled and missed on previous weeks for four days and write on the fifth day.
   b. Teachers, not students, must correct all Maintenance Tests.
   c. Use the Maintenance Test for diagnostic purposes. (Review the section on Maintenance Tests.)
   d. Students record words missed on the Maintenance Test on the My Own Word List in the folder.

7. Pupil Folders

   a. Each teacher should use a file drawer or a prepared box for the folders. The folders should be in the room where spelling is taught.
   b. Students and teachers are both responsible for keeping the folders up-to-date.
   c. Review the section in the Guide on Student Folders. Be sure the following items are in them:

      (1) The Weekly Test-Study-Test Sheets
      (2) The Weekly Spelling Lists
      (3) Corrected Maintenance Tests
      (4) My Own Word List
      (5) Spelling Performance Chart

   d. Review the use of Student Folders with the teachers:

      (1) Individual Assessment of Student's Work
      (2) Parent Conferences
      (3) Record Keeping
      (4) Motivation

Section 3

Supervision of teachers:

1. Teachers must follow the Yearly Plan.
2. Teachers follow instructions on Initial/Final Weekly Tests.
3. Teachers supervise students while they are correcting their own spelling.
4. Teachers must see that students follow the approved study method.
5. Teachers plan for students to review words on previous weekly lists before giving the Maintenance Test.
6. Teachers must correct Maintenance Tests, record data, and assess students' mistakes.

7. The Cedar Rapids program is built upon the following Research-Supported Procedures:

   a. Do not stress meanings of the majority of the spelling words.
   b. Do not include words from the curricular areas in the 60-75 minutes a week devoted to spelling.
   c. Teach by the whole word method rather than by syllables.
   d. Teach few phonic rules.
   e. Allow only 60-75 minutes per week for spelling instruction.
   f. Use the test-study-test method.
   g. Do not point out "hard spots" in words.
   h. Do not write in the air.

8. The principal should see that teachers send letters to parents about the spelling program.

Part IV

Instructions for Teachers

Section 1

1. Memorize the 14 Research-Supported Principles on which the program is based.
2. Study the Educator's Manual by Brad Loomer, 1978.
3. Apply the Research-Supported Principles at all times.
4. Organize a central Spelling Folder box.
5. Use a Spelling Folder for each student.
6. Order sufficient copies of the Weekly Spelling Lists for each student.
7. Order Test-Study-Test Sheets.
8. Order Leveling and Maintenance Test Sheets. (about 7 per student)
9. Order My Own Word Lists. (several for each student)
10. Order Spelling Improvement Charts. (1 per student)
11. Study, memorize, and implement the program as it is designed in the Guidebook.
12. Teach each child the proper way to study spelling. Enforce it.
13. Teach each child the use of the Spelling Folder:

    a. Test-Study-Test Sheets
    b. Weekly Spelling Lists
    c. Corrected Maintenance Tests
    d. My Own Word List
    e. Spelling Improvement Chart

14. The purpose of the Spelling Folder for the teacher is:

    a. Student Evaluation
    b. Parent Conferencing
    c. Record Keeping
    d. Motivation

Section 2

1. Games are to be used for motivation purposes. They are not to be included in the 60-75 minute instruction time.
2. Spelling words may be used in the language arts classes while generating sentences.
3. Written composition enhances spelling achievement.
4. An interested teacher is a good motivator.
5. Most children can learn to spell independently of the teacher. Some children will need to be guided through the spelling process.
6. The atypical child can learn to spell using the recommended method.
7. Spelling is an encoding process. Reading is a decoding process. The methods of teaching the two subjects should not be confused.
8. Improving Spelling Performance is a success-oriented program. If teachers employ proper teaching techniques and research-supported procedures, the majority of students should learn to spell. Some students may never learn to spell more than the 1000 common words.

Date_____

School_____

Dear Parent:

Your child is participating in a spelling program based upon fifty years of research in spelling as reviewed and compiled by Dr. Robert Fitzsimmons and Dr. Bradley Loomer, the University of Iowa.

The major purpose of the program is to help your child learn to spell the 5,507 most common words used in any form of English writing. These words represent 99.2% of the words your child will ever need for written communication.

Students learn to spell by:

(1) Learning lists of spelling words most frequently used in everyday writing.
(2) Studying misspelled words for systematic review.
(3) Writing compositions, sentences, answers to questions, and taking tests.
(4) Being conscious of spelling words in all subject areas such as social studies, science, math, language arts.

Your child may on occasion take a spelling list home to be studied. Those words missed on the pretest are of most importance. As you help your child study please use the following procedure:

1. Copy the word correctly from the model.
2. Look at the word and say it.
3. Cover the word and write it.
4. Check your spelling with the model.
5. Cover the word and write it again.
6. Check the word.

Repeat this procedure about four times for each word.

Because the following procedures are not supported by research:

1. Do not point out hard parts of a word.
2. Do not spell words by syllables.
3. Do not use phonic rules for spelling.
4. Do not use many spelling rules.

Spelling is not taught the same as reading. They are two separate subjects and the methods used must not be confused.

Any question you have regarding the spelling program may be discussed with the teacher.

_____

Teacher